Appl. No. : 10/614,680 Filed : July 3, 2003

### **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

## Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

# Identification of Claims Discussed

1 and 13

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

GB 1,108,584

## **Proposed Amendments**

None

# Principal Arguments and Other Matters

The Applicant's representative argued that Claim 1 is non-obvious over the cited art.

## Results of Interview

The Examiner indicated that Claim 13 and all claims dependent and/or readable thereon would be allowable over the art of record.

Appl. No. : 10/614,680 Filed : July 3, 2003

#### REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner Manoharan for the courtesy of granting a telephonic interview to the Applicant's representatives Daniel Altman and Marina Gordey. The following amendments to claims are the result of the interview. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a related application. Claims 13 and 22 were amended to be in independent form. Pending Claims 2-5, 9-12 as well as withdrawn claim 24 have been amended to depend of Claim 13. Claims 4 and 9 have been canceled as redundant. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. The following addresses the substance of the Office Action.

#### Non-obviousness

During the interview the Examiner indicated that Claim 13 and all claims dependent and/or readable thereon would be allowable over the art of record, and in the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 22 and 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims accordingly as described above, with the exception that the minor limitation from Claim 11 was not included in Claim 13. Therefore, currently amended Claims 2-10, 12-23 should be now allowable.

#### Rejoinder

Claims 24-26 have been made dependent on the amended Claims 13 and 22. Accordingly, the withdrawn Claims 24-26 should be rejoined under the rules of M.P.E.P. §821.04 and examined for patentability.

Appl. No. : 10/614,680 Filed : July 3, 2003

#### CONCLUSION

Applicants have endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action and the Interview Summary. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: November 9,2006

By:

Marina L. Gordey

Registration No. 52,950

Agent of Record

Customer No. 20,995

(805) 547-5580

2990479 110306